DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 409 CS 214 437

AUTHOR Johannessen, Larry R.
TITLE The Roots of a Dynasty: The Rise of Warriner's "Grammar and Composition."
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 71p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational History; *English Instruction; High Schools; High School Students; *Rhetorical Theory; Teacher Education; *Textbooks; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; *Warriner (John)

ABSTRACT

Noting the popularity and wide use of John Warriner's series of English grammar and composition textbooks and workbooks for high school students (first published in 1948), this paper argues that rhetorical theory informs the series, despite Warriner's claims that his approach was based on axioms of writing instruction. The paper also speculates on how teacher training in the 1940s and 1950s may have contributed to the series' market success. After a brief review of related research, the paper first analyzes the nature and development of late 19th century current-traditional rhetorical theory. The paper next shows how the Warriner text is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. The paper also compares the Warriner text with three popular competing textbooks of the day, in terms of their theoretical basis of language and composition and their treatment of the paragraph, a key feature of current-traditional rhetoric and Warriner's approach. The paper examines teacher training, preparation for teaching of writing, and how an absence of any real knowledge in rhetoric and composition may have contributed to the initial success of the Warriner text. The paper concludes with a discussion of how teacher training, competing texts, Warriner's current-traditional rhetoric, and rhetorical theory and practice in secondary schools contributed to the initial success of Warriner's text. Contains 52 references. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 409

The Roots of a Dynasty:

The Rise of Warriner's *Grammar and Composition*

By

Larry R. Johannessen

Assistant Professor of English

1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Saint Xavier University

3700 West 103rd Street

Chicago, Illinois 60655

Telephone: (312) 298-3236
Fax: (312) 779-9061

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Johannessen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Home Address:
1253 Reading Court
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS214437

In 1948, Harcourt Brace quietly published the first edition of John Warriner's *Handbook of English: 1* for 9th and 10th grades, along with an accompanying series of workbooks--one for each grade, 9 through 12. In 1951, apparently convinced that their new series would be a success, they published Warriner's *Handbook of English: 2* for 11th and 12th grades. No one at the time could have predicted the impact that this series would have on the teaching of writing in the secondary school. By 1954, as the series was going into its second edition, more than one million copies had been sold and Harcourt was claiming in its advertisements that "WARRINER" was "a classroom word" (*English Journal*, January 1954). In other words, since many students did not purchase their own textbooks, but rather used books supplied by the school, and since many schools used the same textbooks for many years, it is quite possible that by the end of 1953 considerably more than one million secondary students--perhaps three or four times as many--had actually been taught how to write from Warriner's handbooks. In addition, based on the large sales figures, it is clear that many English teachers seemed to believe, as the Harcourt advertisements claimed, that "the *English Workshop* method really works" (*English Journal*, September 1954).

In 1986, Harcourt published the 10th edition of Warriner's *English Composition and Grammar*: 7th through 12th grade series, plus two editions of the *English Workshop* series. By this point, Warriner's was "the most widely used composition text" (Applebee 1986, p. 95), and just as Lindley Murray's grammar books had become so popular in secondary schools during the first third of the nineteenth century that his name became synonymous with language study (Stahl 1965 , p. 39, and Tchudi and Mitchell 1989, p. 7), the name Warriner had become synonymous with composition instruction in

the secondary school. In fact, by the late 1980's most major composition textbooks were doing their best to "out-Warriner Warriner" (Guth 1989, p. 16).

Clearly, Warriner's method has had a tremendous impact on the teaching of writing in the secondary school. However, despite the dominace of the Warriner method in the teaching of writing in the secondary school in the second half of the twentieth century, "Warriner bashing" has become a popular pastime for critics and scholars alike. Yet, no researcher has done a serious study of the theory that guides this highly influential series. This study will attempt to show that despite the author's claims that his approach is based on the axioms or essentials of writing instruction, rhetorical theory does in fact inform Warriner's series and that theory is primarily derived from nineteenth century rhetorical thought. In addition, the fact that the series is based on this theory may be a major reason for the initial market success of the book.

Further, while educational historians such as Bowles and Gintis (1976), Kett (1977), and Tyack (1974) have examined the social or demographic conditions that have helped shape schooling in America, no researcher has attempted to determine the possible relationship between these conditions and the market success of a particular textbook series. This study will also speculate on how one of these conditions, teacher training, in the late 1940's and early 1950's may have contributed to the initial market success of Warriner's texts.

In the first section of this study, I briefly review related research. I examine studies that trace the history of English studies, those that trace the history of rhetorical theory and writing instruction in American schools and colleges, those that examine major influences in general education and the

English curriculum, and those that focus on textbooks. In the second section, I analyze the nature and development of late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical theory. In the third section, I show how the Warriner text is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. In the next section, I compare the Warriner text with three popular competing textbooks of the day. I compare Warriner with these competing texts in terms of their theoretical basis of language and composition and their treatment of the paragraph, a key feature of current-traditional rhetoric and Warriner's approach. This analysis shows why many teachers may have chosen Warriner's over these competing texts. In the next section of the paper, I examine teacher training, preparation for teaching of writing, and show how an absence of any real knowledge in rhetoric and composition may very well have contributed to the initial success of the Warriner text. I conclude the paper with a discussion of how teacher training, competing texts, Warriner's current-traditional rhetoric, and one other factor, contribute to the initial success of Warriner's text.

Review of Related Research

Scholars and researchers have traced the history of English studies in this country and examined English textbooks. Researchers such as Applebee (1974) and Graff (1987), for example, have presented accounts of the study of literary texts in the English curriculum, but they intentionally exclude a consideration of rhetoric and composition in school and college English programs. A number of scholars, such as Berlin (1984, 1987, and 1990), Conners (1986), Fogarty (1959), Halloran (1990), Kitzhaber (1953), and Stewart (1978) have traced one or more aspects of the history of rhetorical

theory and/or writing instruction in American schools and colleges from their earliest beginnings through the mid-1980's. While many of these studies often include at least some discussion of textbooks, they do not attempt to analyze the theory that guides a particular textbook nor explain the possible relationship between the theory and market success of a text. A few studies, such as Botts (1970) and Parker (1979), have examined one or more of the major influences in general education or the English curriculum in an attempt to determine the effects that these have had on English instruction. While some consideration of textbooks is often a part of these studies, their primary purpose is more general. Botts, for example, is concerned with determining why the progressive movement in education failed in English.

A few studies have focused on textbooks. Tchudi (1979), for example, examines the study of composition and rhetoric in American secondary schools between 1840 and 1900 with careful attention to the textbooks used during this time period. Conners (1986) presents a fascinating analysis of the role of textbooks in the development of the teaching of rhetoric and composition in American colleges. Although primarily concerned with tracing the history of the English curriculum in American high schools, Stahl's (1965) study includes some analysis of textbooks, including Warriner's texts. Gruen (1934) focuses on the study of grammar in American high schools from 1900 through 1930 with considerable attention to textbooks. Finally, Lynch and Evans (1963) conduct a very detailed comparative analysis of secondary English textbooks, including composition texts--the Warriner texts and workbooks are a part of their study. While each of these studies contributes to our understanding of the role of textbooks in rhetoric and composition instruction in secondary schools, none

of them attempts to analyze the theory that guides the highly influential Warriner series nor account for the popularity of the first edition of Warriner's texts.

Warriner's Current-Traditional Rhetorical Theory

In the preface to to his *Handbook of English 1* (1948), John Warriner seems to claim that his text is based on the essentials of writing instruction, without which no program in writing could exist. He says, for example, that

> The chapters on composition are meant to be exact guides with definite directions to help students learn the steps in building a paragraph and planning a longer composition. All of the basic skills of composition--outlining, organizing ideas, using the library--are fully presented. . . . In all these composition chapters, the usual elaborate textbook motivation has been omitted, leaving more space for basic skills and forms. (pp. vi-vii)

Clearly, Warriner fails to see that what he has decided to present in his text is only one of infinite possibilities. He sees what he presents as the necessary building blocks for any writing program. The teacher may use these essentials any way she pleases because the approach does not, as he states earlier in his preface, "impose a method or a sequence" (p. v). However, Warriner thinks that his basics are everyone's basics.

Despite his claim that the text is based on the essentials of writing instruction, Warriner's approach is actually based on a rhetorical theory that

has its indirect roots in Scottish Common Sense Realism of the eighteenth century (elaborated in the rhetorics of George Campbell, Hugh Blair, and Richard Whately) and the work of Scottish rhetorician Alexander Bain; and, his approach is directly derived from the nineteenth century American rhetorical theory of Adams Sherman Hill and Barrett Wendell, both of Harvard, and John Franklin Genung of Amherst. This rhetoric is today labeled current-traditional rhetoric and is most fully embodied in the textbooks published by these three men in the last twenty or so years of the nineteenth century.

In order to understand how Warriner's texts epitomize current-traditional rhetorical theory, it is first necessary to examine the nature and development of the ideas contained in this theory. The term "current-traditional rhetoric" was first used by Fogarty (1959) to describe some of the major assumptions and characteristics of the rhetoric on which Warriner's text is based.

In its most general sense current-traditional rhetoric might be defined as writing as an extension of the scientific method, with emphasis on the inductive method (Berlin 1990). Berlin (1984) notes that this rhetoric accepts the faculty psychology of eighteenth century rhetoric, along with the most mechanical features of Campbell, Blair, and Whately, such as the forms of discourse, correctness, and stylistic concerns, and makes them the only concern of the writing teacher (p. 62). From another point of view, current-traditional rhetoric is the manifestation of the assembly line in education. In short, it is the triumph of the scientific and technical world view (p. 62).

Berlin (1984) explains that faculty psychology of the eighteenth century rhetoric is mechanical, locating reality in the external world. It attempts to take into account all of the features of human behavior--the

sensory and rational, the ethical, and the aesthetic. Campbell, Blair, and Whately considered persuasion to be the apotheosis of human art--or of rhetoric--because it addresses itself to the total person: the emotions and the will, as well as the understanding, the reason, and the imagination. These faculties were mechanically conceived: they function independently of each other and they depend upon sensory experience; they are receptacles or muscles brought into play by experience. They do not shape experience, but are shaped by it. Still, all are considered necessary to the rhetorical act, even if all are not involved at any one time (pp. 62-63).

Current-traditional rhetoric accepts this faculty psychology, Berlin (1984) notes, but removes ethical and all but the most elementary emotional considerations from the concern of rhetoric. Rhetoric's sole appeal is to the understanding and reason, with its highest manifestation to be found in exposition and argument. The distinction between argument--the bringing about of convinction through appeals to the reason--and persuasion--appealing to the will through emotion in order to bring about action--is also accepted. Persuasion, however, is made the province of oratory and is relegated to speech departments. The appeals to imagination and emotion found in poetry are consigned to the literature section of the English department. In this conception, the business of the composition teacher is to train the remaining faculties, and despite the attention paid to argument, this effort focuses mostly on the understanding, the faculty involved in scientific investigation. Exposition, or "setting forth," what is inductively discovered becomes the central concern of writing classes. According to Berlin, this is also the kind of writing most valued by the technologically oriented business community. Writing becomes training the student in technical writing (p. 63).

According to Berlin (1984), this view of writing severely restricts the composing process. The writer's responsibility is to rid himself of the trappings of culture that distort his perceptions. He is to be objective, detached, in observing experience. The purpose of writing is to report, not interpret, what is inductively discovered. Invention is not necessary. The job of composing is to find the language that corresponds to the observed phenomena. Sign and thing are arbitrarily connected, and the writer's task is to select the sign that best captures the thing-in-itself. Teaching the student to do so--teaching syle--is the real purpose of a writing course, since the rest is prescribed by the scientific method, or the method of the discipline the student is pursuing. The audience is not important since all that is asked of the writer is to affect the appropriate faculty, reproducing the original experience in the mind of the reader. In other words, the audience is passive and static and does not contribute to the shaping of meaning (pp. 63-64).

Berlin (1984) points out that in current-traditional rhetoric the definition of rhetoric that persisted was a simplification of Campbell's adaptation construction, emphasizing that the writer's aim is to bring about a particular effect on the audience (p. 64).

One significant way that current-traditional rhetorical theory simplifies Campbell's adaptation construction is in the important area of invention. The *invention* of discovery of classicical rhetoric (for example, discovering the appropriate argument or enthymeme to use) is replaced by a managerial invention, taking the shape of the forms of discourse--description, narration, exposition, and argument. Rhetoric, according to current-traditional rhetoric, cannot teach the discovery of the content of discourse, but it can teach students to manage it, once found, so that it

appeals to the appropriate faculty. This view of invention makes it a part of arrangement. Since language must be chosen to embody the content of thought, the study of diction and sentence structure becomes a major concern, both resting on eighteenth century theories of language (p. 64).

Berlin (1984) argues that major textbook writers of the late nineteenth-century, such as Adams Sherman Hill, Barrett Wendell, and John Franklin Genung, relegate invention to arrangement. The effect on the audience, rather than the discourse, is the determiner of inventional strategies. Consequently, these writers divide discourse into forms, according to the faculty which is to be addressed. He notes that the forms of discourse have a long and rich history, originating in Campbell and formalized in the nineteenth century by Alexander Bain. The inventional advice offered in textbooks in the late nineteenth century consisted of advice on shaping the message so that it will act on the appropriate faculty (pp. 64-65).

Managerial invention is found most tellingly in textbooks by Genung and Hill. The second part of his *Practical Elements of Rhetoric* (1885), Genung entitles "Invention." After explaining that invention is a "natural gift" that can be cultivated by "habits of observation, thought, and reading," he presents chapters on outlining, on using the thoughts of others, and the following:

IV Invention dealing with Observed Objects: Description

V Invention dealing with Events: Narration

VI Invention dealing with Generalizations: Exposition

VII Invention dealing with Truths: Argumentation

VIII Invention dealing with Practical Issues: Persuasion.

(pp. 248-449)

Hill offers the same managerial invention in his *Principles of Rhetoric* (1878), and he presents succinct explanations for how each form appeals to a single faculty in isolation from the others. Description brings "before the mind of the reader persons or things as they appear to the writer" (p. 248). Narration is similar but it shows "persons and things in action" (p. 262). Exposition is explanation, but it "does not address the imagination, the feelings, or the will. It addresses the understanding exclusively, and it may deal with any subject-matter with which the understand has to do" (p. 300). Argument, Hill explains, "like exposition, addresses the understanding," but it leads to "belief" rather than understanding (p. 326). Persuasion "is addressed not so much to the intellect as to the feelings." As these examples illustrat, in current-traditional rhetoric invention involves shaping the subject matter so that it appeals to the right faculty, the faculty selected rising inevitably out of the subject matter.

Berlin (1984) explains that in the late nineteenth century there was one other notable way that major textbook writers and college instructors attempted to provide students with something to say when they wrote--the composition topic. Assigning a subject for student essays originated with Roman rhetoric, but it was given renewed emphasis at the end of the last century. The topics offered were intended to appeal to the students, growing out of personal experience. On the surface, this seems to be a new development. In practice, however, these topics were commonly based on the forms of discourse (p. 68). Genung, for instance, assigned topics appropriate to the forms in order of difficulty--description, narration, exposition, and argumentation--maintaining that these proceeded from the

most elementary faculties to the most complex (1887, pp. 26-28). These topics, according to Berlin, tended to enourage either close observation, in the scientific sense, or the use of research materials, the thinking of others. In both cases, the student was asked to report on what was external to him, either empirical data or the work of better observers than himself (p. 68).

Berlin's (1984) research indicates that the managerial scheme of invention made arrangement, through the forms of discourse, of central importance. However, current-traditional rhetoric addresses the problem of arrangement in two other important ways: the paragraph and the principles of unity, coherence, and emphasis (p. 68).

Berlin (1984) and other scholars, such as Lunsford (1982) and Rogers (1965), trace the importance of the paragraph in current-traditional rhetoric to Alexander Bain (1866) and his six rules for the paragraph. These rules are: (1) "The bearing of each sentence upon what precedes shall be explicit and unmistable" (p. 109); (2) Use parallel structure "when several consecutive sentences iterate or illustrate the same idea" (p. 114); (3) "The opening sentence, unless so constructed as to be obviously preparatory, is expected indicate with prominence the subject of the paragraph" (p. 116); (4) "A paragraph should be consecutive, or free from dislocation" (p. 116); or, in other words, the sentences in a paragraph should be logically ordered; (5) The paragraph is understood to possess unity; which implies a definite purpose, and forbids digressions and irrelevant matter" (p. 116); (6) "As in the sentence, so in the paragraph, a due proportion should obtain between principal and subordinate statements"; or, in other words, the principle or proportion means "that everything should have bulk and prominence according to its importance" (p. 117). While the rules offered were generally reasonable, they were, as Berlin (1984) points out, based on the expository

paragraph, the form appropriate to scientific rhetoric. Bain also tended to look upon the six rules as principles without exception, as did those who followed him in their use in the classroom (pp. 68-69).

In America, Berlin (1984) notes, Bain's followers, such as A. D. Hepburn and D. J. Hill, took his ideas about the paragraph a few steps further. First, Hepburn (1875) was the first to argue that the paragraph "was a discussion in miniature," and that its principles of arrangement were the same as that of the essay as a whole (p. 147). Berlin (1984) notes that in the 1890's, when the daily theme became common, the idea that a paragraph was an essay in miniature became highly popular (p. 69). Meanwhile, textbook writers began codifying types of paragraphs. In his *The Elements of Rhetoric and Composition* (1978), D. J. Hill was the first to offer several patterns of paragraph development, including definition, contrast, illustration, and others (pp. 101-182). Here the Aristotelean commonplaces were tapped to become a device for arrangement. Finally, acorrding to Berlin (1984), Fred Newton Scott and Joseph Villiers Denney encouraged the writing of paragraphs according to the forms of discourse: exposition, argumentation, description, and narration. Berlin maintains that their codification of nineteenth century thinking on the paragraph has stood until recently (p. 69).

Berlin (1984) argues that the appearance of unity, coherence, and emphasis as principles of arrangment is closely related to the development of interest in the paragraph. Earlier forms of the three can be traced--first seen in Blair, developed by Bain, and then presented in a variety of ways by textbooks between 1870 and the end of the century. Barrett Wendell used the three in the form that finally caught on. A number of textbook writers, most notably A. S. Hill, had argued that the principles involved in the

construction of sentences could be appled to the paragraph. Other writers, including Wendell, extended the application to the essay as a whole (pp. 69-70). According to Wendell, instruction in arrangement can be organized around the three principles: "(1) Every composition should group itself about one central idea; (2) The chief part of every composition should be so placed as readily to catch the eye; (3) Finally, the relation of each part of a composition to its neighbors should be unmistakable" (1891, p. 29). Wendell's triad, according to Lunsford (1982), eventually led "to our own long-familiar trinity of unity, coherence, and emphasis" (p. 295).

Berlin (1984) explains that the focal point of current-traditional rhetoric is style. He argues that the emergence of the principles of unity, coherence, and emphasis, as well as the attention to the paragraph, was an extension of Blair's treatment of style. Blair was attempting to discover what in rhetoric was reducible to rule, and American textbooks between 1870 and 1900 applied his dictates to the structure of the discourse as a whole, as well as to all its parts, adding in the process Campbell's and Whately's advice on the word and sentence. Composition textbooks during the period were commonly arranged in order of the word, the sentence, the arrangement of larger units--the paragraph and the whole composition--and the forms of discourse (p. 70). In a footnote, Berlin notes that in later textbooks this order was reversed, perhaps in recognition that decisions about the parts must be made with reference to the whole (p. 101). As will be discussed below, Warriner would return to the earlier organization, and this method of organization would become the standard in secondary schools once again.

Berlin (1984) explains that between 1870 and 1900 the main concern of textbooks was style. This was the case because style--along with the forms of discourse--could be reduced to a set of succinctly stated abstract

principles. Since the subject matter of discourse had been discovered outside of rhetoric, arrangement and expression became the main concerns. Experience is inherently arranged in orderly patterns, the forms being simple aids to recording them. This leaves style, in this view, conceived as the matching of sign to nonverbal reality. During this time period, two influential textbooks, A. S. Hill's *Foundations of Rhetoric* (1892) and Barrett Wendell's *English Composition* (1891), focused on writing as style (pp. 70-71).

Blair, Campbell, and Whately, according to Berlin (1984), had all listed qualities of style to be sought in writing and speaking. Whately, for example, simplified the longer lists of Blair and Campbell to perspecuity, energy, and elegance. American textbook authors simply recommended the abstract principles of the old order. Hill and Wendell, for example, insisted on clearness, force, and elegance, and Genung on clearness, force, and beauty. Other texts introduced economy (p. 71).

According to Berlin (1984), most textbooks in the late 1800's included a discussion of figurative language. These were again based on Blair and Campbell, arguing for figures as ornamentation, mere mechanical devices added to thought in order to communicate rational or empirical truths more effectively. Gradually, however, these discussions were dropped from composition texts as literature courses appropriated this area of rhetoric. The result was a further limiting of the province of the writing course, focusing on the use of language in a way appropriate to science and technology (pp. 71-72).

Berlin (1984) argues that the modern obsession with superficial correctness as a signficant measure of accomplished prose had its beginnings in the late nineteenth century. Usage and grammar were deep and abiding

concerns of composition books during this time. A major reason for this is related to the influence of the Harvard Reports which made the ability to write correctly, if not necessarily with intelligence, an important rite in the entrance process for college. The mark of the educated became the use of a certain version of the native language, a version that tended to coincide with the dialect of the upper middle-class, the group that had customarily attended college. Children of the lower orders were now asked to prove their worthiness for a place in the upper ranks of society--now defined by profession as well as income--by learning this dialect. As a result, "composition teachers became the caretakers of the English tongue," and more important, "the gatekeepers on the road to the good things in life, as defined by the professional class" (pp. 72-73).

According to Berlin (1984), most composition textbooks adopted Campbell's prescriptions on diction: it must be reputable, present, and national. A. S. Hill uses Campbell's offenses against grammatical purity in the first book of his *Principles of Rhetoric and Their Application* (1878), discussing barbarisms, improprieties, and solecisms. Genung (1885) included accurate use, present use, intelligible use, and scholarly use--again a variation of Campbell. These discussions were authoritative in tone and frequently arbitrary, imposing standards that are clearly dialectical biases of a particular class. The authors, however, assume the voice of expert witnesses, reporting on certain and irrefutable matters (pp. 72-73).

Interestingly, Kitzhaber (1953) notes that grammar did not first appear in college-level texts because knowledge of it was assumed as a condition of college entrance (pp. 299-311). However, Berlin (1984) explains that with the admission of working-class students to college, grammar found

its way into writing courses. Unfortunately, the grammar used was an eighteenth century construction (p. 73).

Berlin (1984) explains that by the end of the century the typical current-traditional composition textbook was devoted to the forms of discourse, stylistic matters organized around the principles of unity, coherence, and emphasis, and discussions of usage and grammar. Superficial correctness had become the most important measure of accomplished prose. These books were designed to serve the professional aspirations of the middle class. There was an avowed commitment to the practical. This meant, the textbook authors explained, that the course was to be organized around actual writing, not memorizing rhetorical principles. The stress on the practical also meant, according to authors like Genung, for example, that students were to learn to write by studying literary models, especially the informal essay. The idea was that students were to discover the stylistic principles of the models for themselves and then apply them in their own composing (pp. 73-74).

Finally, Berlin (1984) notes that one of the most disappointing features of current-traditional rhetoric is that if textbooks told students anything about the stages of composing, they provided a mechanical model that would become standard after the turn of the century. The student was to select a subject, narrow it to a thesis, make an outline of the essay, write the essay, and edit it for correctness (p. 74). For example, this is precisely the advise given by Genung in his popular, *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric* (1885, pp. 248-326). Berlin (1984) adds that the student might also be given suggestions for introductions and conclusions that would also become standard after the turn of the century. While the student was often told to adapt his message to the audence, he was given no instruction for doing so,

or he was given an abstract model of audience response based on the old faculty psychology and the forms of discourse. This practice would also become standard well into the twentieth century (p. 74).

Analysis of Warriner s Text

In this section. I will examine Warriner's text and show how it epitomizes current-traditional rhetorical theory and practice. I will begin by analyzing what he says in his preface about writing which reveals that his approach is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. I will then examine the general content of the text and show how this further reveals that his approach is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. Finally, I will examine the content of the composition chapters and show how virtually every aspect of his approach is directly influenced by current-traditional rhetorical thought.

Even though Warriner claims that his text is based on the essentials of writing, it is clear from his preface that his text is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. For example, in the preface to *Book 1*, Warriner says,

> The chapters on composition are meant to be exact guides with very definite directions to help students learn the steps in building a paragraph and planning a longer composition. All of the basic skills of composition--outlining, organizing ideas, using the library--are fully presented. (pp. vi-vii)

Here we see strong links between Warriner and those textbooks writers of the late nineteenth century. Warriner's composing process is as mechanical as that of his forebearers: there are "very definite directions" or rules to learning "the steps" in composing. Those "steps" are the same as those from

nineteenth century textbooks: "outlining, organizing ideas, [and] using the library." Note that there is no invention in the classical sense, but there is managerial invention or "organizing ideas." Also, Warriner hints at the focus on expository writing with the necessity to learn how to use the library as a composing skill. Obviously, students will be "setting forth" or reporting the wisdom of better observers than they are in their compositions.

In addition, Warriner announces in the first paragraph of his preface that a major emphasis of his textbook is to "state clearly and illustrate fully the rules and conventions of standard English usage" (p. iii). In fact, he adds to the importance of this emphasis by stating that teachers will find that his book contains "enough practice material to fix those rules and conventions firmly in their students' speech and writing," and it "will help them teach the essentials of grammar-usage" (p. iii). This is a clear statement of the importance of grammar and usage and emphasis on superficial correctness in Warriner's approach that is characteristic of current-traditional rhetoric.

However, the true importance of grammar and usage is most clearly seen by examining the contents of the texts. *Book I* contains 22 chapters in 482 pages of text. Ten of the 22 chapters, 232 pages of text, are devoted to grammar and usage. Eight chapters, 112 pages of text, are devoted to mechanics and spelling. A mere 4 chapters, 138 pages of text, are devoted to composition. In addition, remove chapter 12, which is really devoted to library skills, from the total of composition chapters, and the result is a mere three chapters, or 95 pages of text, actually devoted to composition. In other words, 48 percent of the text is devoted to grammar and usage, 20 percent to composition, 23 percent to mechanics and spelling, and 9 percent to library skills. Grammar and usage accounts for nearly half of the text, and Warriner devotes more than twice the amount of space in the text to

grammar and usage as he does for composition. Clearly, given the emphasis of the text, this is an approach in which good writing is equated with correctness. It is a text that Genung, Wendell, and Hill probably would have felt very comfortable using in their own classrooms in the late nineteenth century.

There are those who might argue that it is understandable that *Book 1* focuses on grammar and usage: after all, it is designed for ninth and tenth grade students. The facts reveal that *Book 2* is set up nearly the same as *Book 1*. *Book 2* is longer than *Book 1*: it consists of 32 chapters in 577 pages of text. Nineteen chapters, or 293 pages, are devoted to grammar and usage. Four chapters, 89 pages, are devoted to mechanics and spelling. Four chapters, 63 pages, are devoted to library and dictionary skills. Five chapters, 132 pages, focus on composition. In other words, 51 percent of the text is devoted to grammar and usage, 23 percent to composition, 15 percent to mechanics and spelling, and 11 percent to library and dictionary skills. These figures are very similar to those for the earlier book. As with the earlier book, slightly more than half of it is devoted to grammar and usage and more than twice as much space is devoted to grammar and usage as is devoted to composition. These figures show that the major emphasis of *Book 2*, as with *Book 1*, is on grammar and usage or superficial correctness as the measure of good writing which is characteristic of current-traditional rhetoric.

While examining the general content of the texts indicates the major emphasis of Warriner's approach, analysis of the content of his composition chapters reveals the full extent to which his approach is based on current-traditional rhetorical theory. In both books, Warriner's composition chapters follow a familiar pattern. In the ninth and tenth grade book, students learn

how to write a paragraph in chapter 10. Then, in chapter 11, students are taught how to write a whole composition. Finally, in chapter 13, students learn how to write letters. In *Book 2*, students learn how to write "effective" paragraphs in chapter 24. Then, they learn how to write "interesting, well-organized compositions" in chapter 25. Chapter 26, the most unusual chapter in the text, presents what Warriner calls "exercises in composition." In this chapter, students work with paragraphs for various purposes--such as, "arranging ideas in logical order," "eliminating vague pronouns," and "avoiding wordiness" (p. 413). In addition, students also learn how to write a precis, the opinion essay, and the one paragraph factual report. In chapter 27, students learn how to write a research paper. Finally, chapter 28 focuses on writing letters "according to standard practice."

The pattern in both books is quite revealing. Before students can write a composition, they must know what a paragraph is and be able to write one. In a like manner, before students are capable of writing a research paper, they must be taught how to write a composition. This follows the pattern of current-traditional rhetorical theory discussed above. Add to these chapters the earlier chapters in the books that focus on grammar and usage, and the result is an even closer alignment with popular current-traditional rhetoric texts of the late nineteenth century: Warriner begins with the study of words, followed by sentences, then paragraphs, and finally the whole composition, following exactly the arrangement Berlin (1984) identified in current-traditional rhetoric texts of the late nineteenth century.

Many of the popular current-traditional texts in the late nineteenth-century followed a similar pattern: They begin with a chapter on the word, followed by one on the sentence, then by one or more on the paragraph, and

finally, a chapter for each of the major forms of discourse. Genung's, *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric*(1885) and A. S. Hill's *The Principles of Rhetoric and Their Application*(1878) are two notable examples of texts that follow this organizational pattern. At first glance, it appears that Warriner deviates from this pattern. In his ninth and tenth grade text, he discusses the forms of discourse, description, "explanatory" or exposition, narration, and argument (pp. 222-236), in his chapter on writing paragraphs. This appears to be a deviation from the time honored pattern of arrangement. In reality, however, this strategy enables Warriner to accomplish two important goals of current-traditional rhetoric with one stroke: he is able to quickly dispense with having to deal with the various forms of discourse in his chapter on writing the composition; and, at the same time, this enables him to focus his chapter on writing the whole composition on exposition which Berlin (1984) maintains was of central importance in current-traditional rhetorical theory. Warriner never mentions the other forms of discourse after his chapter on the paragraph. It is certainly implied that a writer could use the rules he presents to write a composition in any form of discourse, but clearly his rules (discussed below), like those developed by Bain and others, are based on exposition. In fact, all of the model essays he presents in the chapter for analysis or exercises are expository. In short, Warriner quickly dispenses with those forms of discourse that are not particularly important in current-traditional rhetorical theory, so that he is able to get to the heart of writing in the current-traditional rhetorical view of the universe of discourse--exposition. In addition, it is important to note that focusing his paragraph chapter on the forms of discourse follows the pattern established by J. D. Hill and others in the late nineteenth century. In other words, except for the fact that Warriner does not discuss the forms of discourse in his

composition chapter, Warriner follows the pattern of current-traditional rhetoric texts at the end of the last century.

In *Book 2* (the eleventh and twelfth grade text), he achieves the same dual purposes discussed above but in a slightly different way. Warriner begins his chapter on the paragraph with a footnote to the chapter title that reads,

> This chapter is concerned primarily with the paragraph in relatively formal, expository writing. The student should realize that the rules for paragraph organization and development given here do not apply to the paragraph in narrative writing or in very informal personal essays. (p. 357)

It is unclear exactly what he means by "very informal personal essays" since personal essays are never discussed in the eleventh and twelfth grade text. Perhaps, Warriner assumes that students already know the various forms of discourse by the eleventh grade, and, therefore, there is no need to discuss them here. In any case, this enables him to dispense with having to discuss the forms of discourse at all. He then focuses the entire paragraph chapter on exposition.

As with the ninth and tenth grade book, he is now free to focus on exposition in his chapter on writing the composition, and that is exactly what he does. He then extends his focus on exposition further in the the next two chapters: in the chapter on exercises in composition, he announces that the exercises students will be doing focus on "rather formal expository writing" (p. 411). In the next chapter, students learn to write a research paper,

which to Warriner means, "an extensive, formal composition giving information gleaned from reading in a number of sources" (p. 437). In other words, this is the "setting forth" or exposition Berlin argues is a major focus of current-traditional rhetoric. Student writers are not asked to interpret: they are merely asked to report the interpretations, insights, and ideas of others who are, of course, better observers than themselves.

In a sense, even Warriner's chapters on writing letters are an extension of his focus on exposition. In each book, the chapter on writing letters divides letters into two general kinds: the friendly letter and business letter. Students are presented with rules to follow in writing each type with particular emphasis placed on following the correct form. Students are also shown different types of friendly and business letters. While friendly letters might not be considered exposition, the models Warriner presents, such as the informal invitation and thank you letter, seem to be primarily exposition. Clearly, the business letters Warriner discusses, such as the letter of adjustment and application, are expository in nature. In other words, Warriner presents writing letters with an emphasis on exposition and form that further reveals his approach to composition is well within the framework of current-traditional rhetoric.

Warriner's view of exposition is a simplification of views expressed by his late nineteenth century progenitors. Like current-traditional textbook writers of the late nineteen century, his definition of exposition centers on the expository paragraph. In *Book I* for example, Warriner says, "Creating a paragraph by details of information in support of the topic sentence is a technique which may also be used when you are explaining something" (p. 225). A bit later he adds, "There is no difference at all in method between a paragraph developed by examples and a paragraph developed by

explanatory pieces of information" (p. 226). Beyond this he offers no further explanation of exposition. However, the text does contain considerable emphasis on how to find information in the library to help students "explain something," and it also contains plenty of expository models of good writing to help students learn how to write good expository paragraphs and compositions.

Warriner's "explaining something" is nothing more than a simplification of Genung's definition of exposition. Genung states that exposition is responsible for "setting forth the meaning of things; and this we may regard as its fundamental office. It is not concerned primarily with establishing the truth or falsity of a thing; it seeks rather what the thing is--what is its real nature, its scope, its relations" (1885, p. 383). Warriner simplifies Genung's rather long explanation: His "explaining something" is the modern equivalent of Genung's "setting forth the meaning of things." Clearly, Warriner's view of exposition is derived from late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical thought. The fact that Warriner does not offer a definition of exposition--fails to even see a need to define it--is consistent with his belief that his approach is based on the "essentials" of writing rather than on a particular theoretical approach.

As previously indicated, Berlin (1984) found that current-traditional rhetorical theory relegates invention to arrangement. Hence, students are taught to arrange or manage content through the forms of discourse, primarily exposition, in order to appeal to the appropriate faculty. This is the approach Warriner uses in his texts. Indeed, the two key words he uses again and again in the chapters on writing paragraphs, compositions, the research paper, and letters are "organization" and "development" (including appropriate examples or information) or, in other words, arrangement. The

idea seems to be that students have a content, and all they need to know is how to put it into a correct form and how to arrange it within that form.

Audience is not directly mentioned in either book, and the implication seems to be that if students follow the correct form and arrange their content appropriately, then they will have achieved their purpose in writing. The closest Warriner comes to stating anything about audience is in his exercises chapter in *Book 2*. He states that in writing an essay of opinion the writer's "purpose" is to "state his point of view and to reveal weaknesses in opposing points of view" (pp. 427-428). In fact, Warriner's view of the opinion paper sounds suspiciously like a simplification of Genung's (1885) explanation of argument. Genung says that the function of argument is "... either to set the truth directly before the mind and adduce facts and arguments to substantiate it; or to attack some erroneous position which being demolished will leave the truth in question free to assert itself" (p. 408). In other words, the argument sets forth the truth, and the truth appeals to the single faculty, the intellect.

Warriner certainly falls in line here with Berlin's (1984) analysis of current-traditional rhetorical theory regarding audience. In fact, the example just cited from Genung supports Berlin contention that current-traditional rhetoric textbooks in the last part of the nineteenth century advised students to shape the message so that it acts on the appropriate faculty (1984, p. 65). Warriner seems to accept this conception of audience, especially given his simplification of Genung's view of argument. What little Warriner does say about audience suggests that he sees the nineteenth century view of audience as another essential element, or self-evident truth, of rhetoric rather than a theoretical basis of his approach.

In fact, the model that Warriner seems to be operating from is exactly what he inherited from nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical thought: an abstract model of audience based on the old faculty psychology and the forms of discourse (Berlin, 1984, p. 74). The obvious weakness of this view of audience is that it is based on an outmoded and overly simplified view of how the mind operates. In this view, appealing to the "intellect" simply means revealing the truth in the form of an argument. Students are taught that what is important is the form: master the form of the opinion paper or argument, and they will have found the way to appeal to the audience. Students are not taught to mold the message to a particular audience. They are not taught various methods they might use to appeal to particular audiences, nor are they taught that different arguments and/or appeals might be more or less effective with different audiences. To Warriner, as with his nineteenth century current-traditional counterparts, audience is audience. No distinctions are made because none are necessary. Follow the form, which appeals to the appropriate faculty, and the audience will be moved--convinced of the truth in the case of the opinion paper--as the writer intends.

Certainly one of the most important elements of Warriner's approach is precisely what Berlin (1984) indicates is important to Warriner's predecessors: the paragraph. In fact, if there is anything remarkable about Warriner's approach, it may be in what he accomplishes in his rules for writing paragraphs. Warriner's rules for the paragraph are: (1) "A paragraph is a series of sentences developing one topic"; (2) "The topic of a paragraph should be stated in a single sentence somewhere in the paragraph. This sentence is the topic sentence"; (3) "In general, place the topic sentence at or near the beginning of the paragraph"; (4) "At the end of

the paragraph, particularly a long one, a writer will sometimes summarize by restating, in different words, the topic sentence he used at the beginning"; (5) "A paragraph is usually developed by means of additional, detailed information given in support of the idea expressed in the topic sentence"; (6) "In developing a paragraph, supply enough information to insure adequate development"; (7) "A paragraph should be unified. Unity is achieved by discussing only one topic in a paragraph, the topic stated in the topic sentence"; (8) "A paragraph is coherent when its ideas are logically and clearly related to one another, and the total effect of the sentences is the clear development of the paragraph idea. One way to achieve coherence is by arranging the details in a paragraph in a clear and logical order. Strengthen the coherence of a paragraph by the use of linking expressions and connectives which help the reader to follow the line of thought from one idea to the next" (*Book 2*, pp. 357-384).

Warriner's eight rules for the paragraph are an adaptation of Bain's (1866) six rules for the paragraph. For example, Bain's third rule that the first sentence should indicate the subject is Warriner's second rule on the topic sentence, and Bain's fifth rule regarding unity in the paragraph is Warriner's seventh rule on unity. In reality, however, Warriner's rules include all of Bain's rules and incorporate some other elements of current-traditional rhetoric into a simple set of rules for writing paragraphs. In addition to Bain's rules, Warriner's rules also establish the paragraph as a mini-essay, are easily applied to the whole composition, and include unity, coherence, and emphasis in a simple set of rules for writing paragraphs.

Warriner establishes the paragraph as a mini-essay and underscores the importance of the paragraph in his view of writing when he explains his first rule: He says, "When you have learned to write a good paragraph, you

will have learned most of the principles of organization required in all writing" (p. 357). In other words, just like his nineteenth century counterparts, Warriner believes in the importance of the paragraph: learn to write a paragraph and you have learned "most" of what is involved in writing a composition--a paragraph is a mini-composition because the principles involved are the same as those for writing a composition.

Warriner also incorporates Wendell's three rules on unity, coherence, and emphasis for the composition into his set of rules for the paragraph and takes them to new heights. In his fourth rule, Warriner indicates that even the end of the paragraph must now stand out or catch the reader's eye by means of what he calls a "clincher sentence." This is a clear adaptation of Wendell's second rule on unity, coherence, and emphasis that the main part of the composition should be organized so that it "readily catch[es] the eye." Warriner's rules for writing paragraphs are clearly those of his current-traditional rhetorical progenitors, and his focus on the importance of the paragraph in writing and on the trinity of unity, coherence, and emphasis further underscore the fact that his approach to composition is based on current-traditional discourse theory.

Warriner's view of the whole composition is that it is an expanded paragraph. Much of the chapter on writing the whole composition is devoted to applying his rules for the paragraph to the composition with emphasis on unity, coherence, and emphasis. The composition, like the paragraph, consists of three parts: the introductory paragraph, main paragraphs, and the concluding paragraph. In Warriner's scheme, the topic sentence of a paragraph becomes the introductory paragraph with a thesis statement for the whole composition. The support and development sentences in a paragraph become the main paragraphs. Finally, the summarizing sentence

or "clincher sentence" of a paragraph becomes the concluding paragraph of a composition. Warriner's rules for writing paragraphs provide this clear and simple movement from paragraph to whole composition. As Berlin (1984) notes, advice on writing introductory and concluding paragraphs was standard in textbooks by the turn of the century. This analysis reveals that Warriner's discussion of these topics is nothing new. Berlin also points out that Wendell and others in the late nineteenth century attempted to apply the rules of arrangement of the paragraph to the composition as a whole. Comparing Warriner's discussion of the arrangement of the paragraph with his discussion of the arrangement of the whole composition reveals that he is simply attempting to do what Wendell and others had attempted earlier.

One important part of Warriner's discussion of the whole composition focuses on unity, coherence, and emphasis. For example, in discussing paragraphing, Warriner provides the following rule: "Paragraph a composition in such a way that the various phases of the subject will stand out clearly" (p. 395). In all, Warriner provides five such rules dealing with unity, coherence, and emphasis. These rules, like those on the paragraph, are derived from Alexander Bain and his American followers. For example, Warriner's rule on paragraphing so that "the subject will stand out clearly" is clearly derived from Wendell's (1891) second principle: "The chief part of every composition should be so placed as readily to catch the eye" (p. 29). Warriner's discussion of the whole composition is the kind of discussion a high school or college student would likely find in a current-traditional rhetoric textbook in the late nineteenth century.

Warriner does not neglect the composing process in his chapter on writing the composition, and, like the rest of his approach, his view of the writing process is derived from current-traditional rhetorical theory. There

are six steps in Warriner's process. His six steps are: "(1) Selecting and limiting the subject; (2) Assembling materials; (3) Organizing materials; (4) Writing the first draft; (5) Revising; (6) Writing the final draft" (p. 385). In the opening paragraph of the composition chapter in *Book 2*, Warriner notes, "The basic steps involved in writing are almost always the same, regardless of what you are writing; and these steps must be so thoroughly understood that you will follow them habitually" (p.385). In other words, the steps Warriner outlines in his writing process are, like the rest of his approach, practically rules or laws because they "are almost always the same" no matter what students are writing. This is a very mechanical view of the writing process.

Warriner's steps are clearly derived from Genung and other similar conceptions of the writing process that, as Berlin (1984) notes, appeared in the late nineteenth century and were standardized after the turn of the century. For example, Genung's process from *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric* involves selecting a subject, narrowing it to a thesis, making an outline of the essay, writing the essay, and editing it for correctness (1885, pp. 248-326). Warriner's process contains each of Genung's stages, stated somewhat differently and two minor additions. Warriner's "organizing materials" appears to differ from Genung's process; however, what it really means is making an outline which is exactly what Genung advises. To the composing process he borrows from Genung, Warriner adds "assembling materials," which involves making a list of ideas before making an outline, and "writing the final draft," which simply means recopying the revised composition neatly (p.405). In short, Warriner's writing process primarily consists of ideas passed on from current-traditional discourse theory of the late nineteenth century.

One major problem with Warriner's mechanistic view of the writing process is that it assumes that there is only one writing process that all writers follow each time they write. This view of the process does not allow for individual differences, nor does it permit modification of the process depending upon the writing situation or task. For example, it assumes that writers use the same process when writing a social note and when writing an argument. Common sense alone indicates that this is simply not the case. Another problem with Warriner's view of the process is that it is a linear. That is, Warriner believes that writers always follow the same six steps in the same order. It does not occur to Warriner that the writing process might be more recursive than linear. For example, Warriner does not allow for the possibility that while writing the first draft a writer might discover that he needs to gather additional materials and so backs up to step #2 in Warriner's process. In short, Warriner's view of the writing process oversimplifies the complexity and recursive nature of the writing process.

Warriner's treatment of style reveals another way that his approach is guided by current-traditional rhetorical thought. As Berlin (1984) notes, American textbook authors of the late nineteenth century simply followed the old order recommending the abstract principles of style first introduced by Blair, Campbell, and Whately. The only new element added by the turn of the century was the idea of economy. Warriner merely follows in the footsteps of his nineteenth century counterparts. For example, Warriner devotes nine chapter (chapters 11-19) in *Book 2* to stylistic concerns. His advice and rules in these chapters closely parallel those of current-traditional rhetoric textbooks of the late nineteenth century. He has chapters on writing clear sentences, including varying structure and complexity, avoiding wordiness, varying "style" at the sentence level, and

using a vocabulary which is fresh (avoiding trite expressions), consistent, idiomatic, and appropriate (with appropriate being the style for formal essays). Warriner s advice and rules in these chapters boil down to being clear, forceful, elegant, and economical; these ideas, written in much the same form in Warriner s series, are contained in textbooks by Hill, Wendell, Genung, and others.

There are at least two major weaknesses with the instruction in these chapters on style, and both problems have their roots in late nineteenth century current-traditional discourse theory. First, even though the rules, advice, and exercises Warriner presents in these chapters are no different than what he presents elsewhere in his texts, they seem particularly narrow in the chapters on style. That is, the operating assumption is that the path to a "good" writing style is for students to memorize abstract rules and apply the rules in exercises that involve identifying and correcting errors in given sentences. At no point in these chapters are students asked to write or to work with their own writing. The assumption seems to be that if students memorize the rules and apply the rules in these exercises, then this knowledge of style will somehow translate into their own writing. It is difficult to see how this will happen. However, the instructional approach Warriner uses is exactly what is contained in late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetoric textbooks by Hill, Wendell, Genung, and others.

Another and, perhaps, more serious weakness with Warriner's approach to style involves the heavy emphasis on formal, primarily expository, writing. For example, Chapter 18 of *Book 2*, which focuses on "us[ing] a vocabulary which is fresh, consistent, idiomatic and appropriate" (p. 271), contains the following rule: "18d. Use a vocabulary which is appropriate to the kind of composition which you are writing--avoid slang in

written composition; use colloquialisms sparingly in formal writing" (p. 281). In this short two page section, students are sternly warned not to use slang in writing, "except in reproducing dialogue," and they are given an evern sterner warning to use colloquialisms "sparingly" in formal writing (pp. 281-282). Students are also told that they need to "control [their] natural tendency to use too many colloquialisms" (p. 282). Warriner concludes this section with three model sentences taken from formal (expository) compositions in which students are to "note the inappropriateness of slang and colloquialisms" (p. 282) in the sentences. The problem here, and throughout these nine chapters on style, is that students are not shown examples of appropriate uses of slang and colloquialisms in writing. In other words, they are not shown the options. The emphasis is on stamping out in students some perceived "evil" stylistic tendencies and on producing young writers whose styles are appropriate for writing formal compostions. When it comes to the subject of style, the only difference between Warriner and his late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetoric counterparts is that Warriner has a stronger moralistic tone to his rules, advice, and exercises. Otherwise, Warriner merely reiterates ideas formalized by current-traditional rhetoric textbook writers of the late nineteenth century.

Another important part of Warriner's approach that is derived from current-traditional rhetoric is his reliance on the imitation of model sentences, paragraphs, and essays of good writing to teach students how to write. In fact, Warriner's ideas are very similar to the approach used by Genung in his *Outlines of Rhetoric* (1893) in which students learn to write by studying literary models, particularly the informal essay, with an eye toward discovering the stylistic principles of the models for themselves and then applying them in their own writing. Like Genung, Warriner utilizes

professional models of good writing to illustrate virtually every element of writing from the topic sentence to the modes of discourse to the different ways to use transitional phrases. In addition, just like the current-traditional rhetoric textbook writers before him, Warriner presents his models in almost exactly the same way as Genung and others in the late nineteenth century: that is, he assumes that students will be able to discover principles of the models for themselves and then apply them to their own writing. Further, he also tends to follow the same instructional pattern in both books: an abstract definition or rule, followed by explanation and elaboration of the definition or rule, and/or followed by brief commentary and introduction of a model, followed by an exercise in which students are to apply what they have learned. For example, in *Book 2*, after presenting his definition of the paragraph and topic sentence and prior to the presentation of his first model paragraph from S. I. Hayakawa's *Language in Action*, Warriner offers the following comment:

> In the following paragraph the topic sentence is italicized. Observe that the author develops the idea in this sentence by listing a number of supporting details. Most paragraphs are developed in this way. (p. 357)

It is important to realize that no comments follow the model paragraph by Hayakawa. Instead, after this brief comment followed by the model, Warriner goes on to a new rule regarding the position of the topic sentence in the paragraph. Supposedly students are to figure out which sentence is the topic sentence by application of the abstract rule or because they are told that it is the italicized first sentence of the model. Otherwise, students

must infer that the paragraph is well organized and how it is organized, that the point is well developed by means of "supporting details," and that the paragraph ends with a clincher sentence. In other words, just like Genung and others, Warriner assumes that students will be able to make the connections between the abstract ideas in his definitions, rules, explanations, and brief comments and the models he presents that contain these elements.

Warriner's first two exercises in his paragraph chapter, which are typical of the exercizes throughout the composition chapters, indicate that he does assume students will be able to apply what has been presented in the text. After presenting the definition of the paragraph and topic sentence, a rule on the placement of the topic sentence, and four model paragraphs (pp. 357-361), students are given the following two exercises:

> Exercise 1. Each of the following subjects can be treated in a paragraph. Select 3 subjects from the list; think through your ideas on each of the 3, and write a topic sentence you could use to introduce a paragraph on it. You will write 3 topic sentences.
>
> 1. Qualities you expect in a "good date"
> 2. Your reasons for liking (or disliking) a certain move star
> 3. Description of a favorite place
> 4. Characteristics of a good dancer
> 5. Rules for safe driving
> 6. Important techniques in tennis (or any sport)
> 7. Typical apparel of a high school boy or girl
> 8. Traits of a popular teacher

9. Planning a budget

10.Physical requirements for a basketball player

Exercise 2. Develop one of the topic sentences in the preceding list into a paragraph of approximately 150 words. (*Book 2*, pp. 361-362)

In other words, after three abstract definitions/rules, some explanation of the definitions/rules, commentary on models, and the presentation of four professional models, students are now to apply this knowledge by writing three topic sentences from ten possible topics and by developing one of these topic sentences into a paragraph. The instructional pattern Warriner uses in his composition chapters is exactly the pattern in current-traditional rhetoric textbooks of the late nineteenth century. Warriner's instruction relies on the assumption that students will be able to infer the necessary knowledge from abstract rules and models and imitate the numerous professional models of good writing presented in the composition chapters. In the example presented, which is typical of exercises in these chapters, students are not shown or told how to generate support for a topic sentence, nor are they given any indication as to what kinds of support would be appropriate. Other than the model paragraphs, students are not told or shown how to determine which topic sentence would be a good one to write about. In addition, they are given no guidance in how to go about writing this paragraph. Finally, they are given no information regarding a purpose or audience for writing. In brief, Warriner's approach assumes students will be able to use knowledge from the abstract rules and model paragraphs in new situations.

Berlin (1984) argues that in matters of diction most current-traditional rhetoric textbooks of the late nineteenth century adopted Campbell's prescriptions. He notes that the discussions in these texts were often authoritative in tone and arbitrary, imposing the standards of the upper-class. Warriner follows in this tradition. For example, he begins part two of his upper-grade book, which deals with writing correct sentences, with a long introductory discussion (pp. 67-73) on the question, "What is good English?" The purpose of this essay is clearly to convince students (and perhaps teachers as well) that they need to learn "standard English," or "the English used by educated people when they are speaking and writing carefully" (p. 69). In an authoritative tone handed down by his nineteenth century forefathers, Warriner notes some of the consequences of failing to learn standard English: "You may be kept out of a club, or left off invitation lists for parties, or kept out of a better-paying job" (p. 68). Therefore, Warriner argues, students must "study carefully the language usage recommended in this book and to make a habit of using it." In this essay, Warriner establishes the basis for his rule-based standard English that students must learn in order to gain entry into the class of "educated people."

There is nothing remarkable or even new about Warriner's rules in his chapters on diction. He offers the same old advice from the late nineteenth century which writers like Hill and Genung borrowed from Campbell. For example, In his *Outlines of Rhetoric* (1893), Genung groups accurate use, present use, intelligible use, and scholarly use, all derived from Campbell, under the headings of "choice of words" (pp. 9-53) and "objects of style" (pp. 116-176). Warriner offers much the same advice as Genung, but presents

his rules under the general headings of "writing correct sentences," "writing clear sentences," and "writing smooth sentences" (*Book 2*, pp. 67-293). In short, Warriner presents the same old ideas on diction handed down from current-traditional rhetorical theory and practice of the late nineteenth century.

Warriner's approach is also influenced by the common nineteenth century practice of providing students with composition topics to help them find something to say when they write. The most important way that Warriner uses composition topics to encourage students to write is by providing topics in exercises. This practice is nothing new. Most popular current-traditional textbooks of the late nineteenth century, such as Hill's *Principles of Rhetoric* (1878) and Genung's *Practical Elements of Writing* (1885), provide students with one or two topics for writing in some exercises. The topics offered are clearly intended to appeal to students, growing out of personal experience. However, most of the topics are based on the forms of discourse and most place primary emphasis on reporting the thinking of others so that students are encouraged to produce exposition. In contast, where his nineteenth century counterparts offer students one or two topic choices in some exercises, Warriner provides many topic choices in virtually every exercise in his composition chapters. As noted above, in his exercises for generating topic sentences and then developing a paragraph from one of the topic sentences, Warriner provides students with ten topics (*Book 2*, pp. 361-362). Even a cursory examination of these topics reveals that, as with his nineteenth century progenitors, on the surface at least Warriner's topic choices are designed to appeal to student interest and perhaps even have a strong basis in personal experience: Students are given a number of possible topic choices from which to develop three topic

sentences and ultimately one paragraph. Many of the topic choices seem to be ones of likely interest to senior high school students: the qualities of a 'good date,' reasons for liking or not liking a particular movie star, characteristics of a good dancer, important techniques in tennis (or any sport), etc. These topics and others from the list would seem to offer students a wide range of possibilities for this short assignment, allowing them to pick topics that are of interest to them and to draw on their personal experiences in developing one of the topics into a paragraph. So far, Warriner seems to have borrowed and expanded on this idea from nineteenth century current-traditional rhetoric.

However, examining these ten topics, as well as most other topics given in exercises in both books, in terms of the forms of discourse and the results are not so positive. They might appeal to student interest and allow for developing a topic from personal experience, but they are also designed to force students to write expository paragraphs within the narrow confines of the Warriner paragraph--topic sentence, development of topic, clincher sentence. Only one of the possible topics, "Description of a favorite place," could produce something other than an expository paragraph. However, given the confines of the assignment, it is difficult to see how students could come up with a paragraph that is more description than exposition (according to current-traditional rhetoric definitions of these modes). Indeed, examining topic choices in assignments in both books reveals that while Warriner nearly always offers topic choices, the choices almost always encourage exposition rather than one of the other forms of discourse. Add to this the fact that the four model paragraphs students have seen prior to this exercise are expository, and it is clear that topic choices aside, exposition is what students are really being encouraged to write.

Of course, part of the reason for the emphasis on exposition in topic choices is due to the importance of the paragraph, the expository paragraph, to the theory. While the topic choices attempt to provide for student interest and personal experience, the narrow definition of the paragraph and Warriner's belief in the importance of learning to write the paragraph get in the way of real choice. Warriner's extensive use of topic choices in exercises is much the same as the attempts made by major current-traditional textbook writers in the late nineteenth century, and his attempt exhibits the same weaknesses and problems.

Finally, Berlin (1984) argues that by the end of the nineteenth century there was an avowed commitment to the practical in current-traditional rhetorical theory. This commitment manifested itself in a number of ways in textbooks and college courses of the time, but primarily in four important ways. First, the writing course was to be organized around actual writing, not memorizing rhetorical principles. Also, as previously indicated, authors like Genung emphasized the study of professional models which would become standard practice in the twentieth century. In addition, Genung and others introduced the practice of providing topic suggestions for writing which was viewed as an important part of practice. Finally, as Stahl (1965) and Tchudi and Mitchell (1989) point out, while students were not required to memorize rhetorical principles, they were required to memorize grammatical rules and work grammar and usage exercises, or drill exercises that focused on correcting errors. This practice, as previously discussed, was popularized by Lindley Murray in the first half of the nineteenth century. Stahl points out that, like current-traditional rhetorical theorists of the late nineteenth century, Murray's grammar was "copied from" the works of eighteenth century grammarians (pp. 38-39).

Warriner certainly believes that his approach places primary emphasis on the practical, and what he means by practice is much the same as current-traditional rhetoric textbook writers of the late nineteenth century. The idea of practice is a major theme in the preface: It is directly mentioned at least five times in the five page preface to *Book 1* and three times in the four page preface to *Book 2*. In addition, Warriner makes it clear that rather than focusing his text on "advanced refinements of style and usage," his text focuses on teaching the "essentials" (*Book 1*, p. iv), which means "a vast amount of drill material," "correlated workbooks" with even more "drill materials," and "more space for basic skills and forms" in writing paragraphs and compositions (pp. vi-vii). In addition, in his introduction to the extensive list of topics for writing in the chapter on writing compositions, Warriner elaborates on his idea of practice by stating, "The way to learn to write is to write" (p. 263). In other words, in the preface and in the text, Warriner states that practice is important to his approach, and he builds practice into his approach in a number of ways. Practice means avoiding discussion of theoretical or complex issues; it means placing a heavy emphasis on memorization of grammar, usage, and composition rules; it means the extensive use of exercises in the text and workbooks to reinforce rules, often focusing on drills; it also means relying heavily on professional models of good writing for analysis and imitation; and, finally, practice means the extensive use of topics for writing contained in exercises. In short, what Warriner means by practice is very similar to the ideas and practices that were popular in current-traditional rhetorical theory and practice in the late nineteenth century. The only new element in Warriner's approach is more exercises or "drill" in the text and workbooks. However, this method was actually first introduced and popularized by Murray, who

had two books: his first volume contains the grammatical rules and the second volume contains exercises (Stahl 1965, pp. 43-44).

Warriner and the Competition

Given that Warriner's approach is based on nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical theory, it is all the more difficult to explain the tremendous market success of the series in the years following World War II. Why would so many English teachers find this approach so appealing nearly halfway through the twentieth century? It is not as if there were no other competing composition textbooks on the market to choose from. In fact, between 1948 and 1953 *English Journal* is full of advertisements and reviews of competing popular and new composition textbooks. Why, then, did English teachers pick Warriner's over other possible choices?

Comparing Warriner's approach with three other popular texts in terms of two important areas--the theoretical basis of the texts in terms of language and composition and their treatment of the paragraph (a key feature of Warriner's approach and current-traditional rhetoric)--reveals significant differences that help to explain why Warriner's texts may have become so popular so quickly.

Three criteria were used in selecting competing texts for comparison. First, a text must have gained at least some degree of popularity and/or positive recognition during the same time period (1948 to 1953) that the Warriner series became popular. Second, a text must represent a clear alternative in terms of approach and/or content. Finally, a text must in some way deal with teaching the paragraph. Based on these three criteria, the three texts selected for comparison are: J. C. Tressler's *English in Action: Course Three*, 4th ed. (1945), M. M. Bryant, M. L. Howe, P. R. Jenkins, and H. T. Munn's *English at Work: Course Two* (1950), and E. C. Woolley, F. W. Scott, and J. C. Tressler's *Handbook of Writing and Speaking* (1944). To determine

if a text met the first criterion. I examined advertisements for and reviews of textbooks in each issue of *English Journal* from 1943 through 1954. Each of these texts were advertised and reviewed in *English Journal* during the post war period and at least two editions of the text or series were printed, which indicates some degree of popularity. How each text meets the second and third criterion will become clear in the following analysis.

Perhaps the most obvious difference between these competing texts and Warriner's text is in the overall organization of the books. Warriner's text begins with grammar, is followed by usage, then composition, and ends with mechanics. Tressler's text begins with oral and written communication, which includes topics such as "public speaking," "building paragraphs," "motion pictures," and "choral speaking," is followed by creative expression, which includes description and the story, and ends with a "Handbook of Speaking and Writing," which includes grammar, usage, mechanics, and speaking techniques. Bryant et al.'s text is similar to Tressler's in that it follows a pattern of writing and speaking, which is organized by themes such as "Taking Inventory," "Reaching the Public," "Building a Paragraph," and "Drivers, Good and Bad," and concludes with a handbook of grammar and usage. Woolley et al.'s *Handbook of Writing and Speaking* begins with a section on "Preparing for Writing and Speaking," which includes chapters on "Using the Library" and "Thinking," moves to a section on "Oral and Written Communication," which includes topics like "Conversation," "The Paragraph," and "Letter Writing," then has a section on "Planning and Writing" that focuses on planning a composition and public speaking, and ends with a standard handbook that moves from parts of speech through spelling.

In contrast to Warriner, these texts place grammar and usage after composition. In the Warriner scheme, students need to know--have

memorized and been thoroughly drilled on--the rules of grammar and usage before attempting to write. These authors do not seem to see composing in the same way at all. In the preface to *English at Work*, Bryant et al. make a point of saying that they attempt to integrate instruction in grammar, usage, and mechanics into each chapter in an "inductive manner" to make it "an integral part of the process of expressing oneself" (p. xi). They are critical of the practice of having students memorize definitions and rules--Warriner's approach.

Clearly, in contrast to Warriner's approach, the overall organization of these competing texts reveals that they see composing and the learning of language (oral and written) as a somewhat messy affair. The texts move back-and-forth between speaking and writing. In contrast, Warriner completely eliminates speaking from his approach. Further, in the competing texts the learning of grammar, usage, and mechanics are of secondary importance. They put these skills in a handbook at the end. In contrast, Warriner's approach begins with learning the rules of grammar. Many English teachers might have rejected these competing texts because they present a more complex view of language learning than Warriner presents. Teachers would have had to accept the assumption that learning to write is closely related to learning to speak and that teaching writing and speaking is a messy process and not dependent on knowing the rules of standard English as a first step. Warriner's view of language learning is simple and rule bound; he makes teaching writing cut and dry and easy for teachers to teach.

Closer examination of these competing texts reveals some important differences between the theoretical assumptions of these texts and Warriner's texts. These differences may reveal why most English teachers

rejected them in favor of Warriner. As suggested above, these texts reflect a dual emphasis on writing and speaking that they refer to as "oral and written expression" or "oral and written communication." The likely source of this emphasis is the general education movement, which traces its roots to World War I and the study of propaganda (Applebee 1974 and Berlin 1987). While general education had always been an attempt to encompass the broad educational base of the curriculum of liberal culture, after World War II it also included elements of progressive education such as a commitment to the individual student, to social values, and to democracy. At the college level, the most conspicuous feature of most general education programs was the communications course. This course was influenced by linguists and semanticists, as well as thinkers from speech communications. At the college level, these courses often involved an equal empasis on writing and speaking with attempts made to integrate a number of areas of the curriculum (Berlin 1987). Applebee (1974) argues that the movement suffered a major split in 1947 which resulted in an end to cooperative efforts between NCTE and the Speech Association of America. While Berlin (1987) argues that the general education movement was "the most significant curricular development in American colleges between 1940 and 1960" (p 92), Applebee suggests that after the split between NCTE and SAA its influence at the secondary level was greatly diminished.

In much the same way as the college communications course, all three of the competing texts place an equal emphasis on speaking and writing. Tressler does it by alternating chapters. Chapters one and two are concerned with speaking: "Interviewing and Conferring" and "Public Speaking." Chapters three and four focus on writing: "Building Paragraphs" and "Explanation." Bryant et al. place equal emphasis on speaking and writing by

organizing their chapters around topics and themes which treat writing and speaking about equally in sub-sections for "Writing Your Ideas" and Speaking Your Ideas." For example, Chapter 6, which deals with "Developing a Time-Sense," contains a little over three pages of text on being accurate in writing a "how-to theme" in the sub-section on "Writing Your Ideas" and a little less than four pages on leading a class discussion of a radio or television program in the sub-section on "Speaking Your Ideas." Finally, Woolley et al. place equal emphasis on speaking and writing by organizing their book around two major sections that give about equal treatment to speaking and writing. The first section, "Preparing for Writing and Speaking," contains a chapter on "Using the Library" and one on "Thinking." The second section, "Oral and Written Communication," contains two speaking chapters, "Conversation" and "Public Speaking," and three composition chapters, "The Paragraph," "Letter Writing," and "Planning and Writing." Even though there is one more chapter on writing than on speaking, writing accounts for only eight more pages of text than speaking.

From a theoretical standpoint, many English teachers may have found these texts troubling. They imply or directly state that learning oral and written language or the concepts and skills involved in speaking and writing are the same. These texts challenge the assumptions of current-traditional rhetoric that place speaking outside of the realm of writing (Berlin 1984). In the years just before World War II and during the war, *English Journal* contains numerous articles advocating some of the ideas contained in these texts. However, if most English teachers were going to use these texts, they would have had to accept the more complex views of language learning presented in these texts. They would have had to accept the idea that teaching writing is complex and somewhat messy. They would have had to

reject the simplistic, rule-bound current-traditional rhetorical view of learning that Warriner presents in his series. It seems quite likely, therefore, that many teachers may have chosen Warriner's over these other texts simply because his view of teaching and learning to write is simplistic and easy to teach.

To one degree or another, these three competing texts also contain popularized elements (although not necessary fair interpretations) of progressive education (Applebee 1974 and Tchudi and Mitchell 1989). This aspect of these texts may also help explain why many English teachers rejected them in favor of Warriner. Bryant et al. contains some of the most obvious examples of popularized elements of progressive education of the three texts. For example, chapter 3, "Your Public and You," devotes six pages to various aspects of telephone conversation. It treats topics such as the importance of the telephone ("At the End of the Wire"), "Using the Telephone at Home," "Using the Telephone in Business," "Using the Telephone at a Friend's Home," "Using the Public Booths," "Oral Practice," "Suggested Dialogs or Monologs," and "Judging My Recitation." Tchudi and Mitchell argue that at the end of World War II when textbooks reduced progressive education to teaching the social graces, such as answering the telephone, and emphasizing the fun of English, it should not be surprising that Warriner's "stern little volume" quickly became "the most influential textbook of the fifties" (1989, p. 16). In other words, another reason why English teachers may have rejected these texts in favor of Warriner's is that they implicitly trivialize some aspects of language learning. If learning the English language involves nothing more than learning the social graces, then it would not be long before someone figured out that society did not need English teachers to

accomplish this task. Warriner s text, as Tchudi and Mitchell point out, at least treats language learning and learning how to write as serious business.

How these competing texts treat the paragraph is also revealing and may indicate still another reason why English teachers rejected them in favor of the Warriner texts. As previously argued, the heart of current-traditional rhetoric is the expository paragraph. Therefore, any current-traditional rhetoric textbook--if it is to be successful, if the audience is going to be able to use it as a teaching (and perhaps learning) tool--must establish the expository paragraph as the centerpiece and probably needs to build much of the rest of the text around the treatment of the expository paragraph. How these three competing texts treat the paragraph appears to fall well within the bounds of current-traditional rhetoric. That is, like Warriner, they all assume, or at least give lip service to the idea that the paragraph, the expository paragraph, is important. Each has at least one chapter on the paragraph early in the text. Also, like Warriner, they all discuss the same topics and use the same terminology. Each of them covers topics such as "Topic Sentence" and "Clincher Sentence"; and, of course, each discusses unity, coherence, and emphasis. In a word, there seems to be little difference between these textbooks and Warriner in terms of how they treat the paragraph.

However, on closer examination, what becomes clear is that once one gets beyond the surface similarities, these texts are actually somewhat at odds with some of the assumptions of current-traditional rhetoric in terms of the paragraph. For example, in Bryant et al.'s chapter on the paragraph, topic sentence is defined on the second page of the chapter as that sentence in a paragraph that "shows what the other sentences are going to say" (p. 74). This definition is presented in the context of an example of a topic

sentence involving a conversation between a father and son. In other words, the authors use the terminology, "topic sentence," and define it in current-traditional terms, but they are just as interested in establishing the close relationship between oral and written composition, which violates the assumption of current-traditional rhetoric that speaking is outside of the bounds of rhetoric. While students are advised to create a topic sentence that begins a paragraph and shown a model paragraph that begins with a topic sentence, the authors say nothing else about topic sentences. In fact, in this chapter called "Building a Paragraph," the authors say little else about paragraphs, focusing instead on the steps in writing a paragraph or "theme." While the authors use a model expository essay to illustrate a paragraph with a topic sentence, they make no distinctions in this chapter about types of paragraphs or modes of development. The other two competing texts do provide a more thorough explanation of the paragraph in terms of current-traditional rhetoric in their chapters on the paragraph, but perhaps because of their dual emphasis on writing and speaking, they fall far short of the extensive coverage of the paragraph that is evident in Warriner's texts.

Moreover, none of these competing texts attempt to establish the paragraph as a miniature essay. Their discussions of the paragraph differ little from their discussions of other types of writing. In other words, the paragraph is neither more no less important than say the short story or the expository essay. Warriner, on the other hand, carefully establishes the importance of the paragraph, provides extensive coverage of the paragraph, and builds a case for the paragraph as a mini-essay.

For many English teachers, particularly those who knew only current-traditional rhetoric, how these competing texts dealt with the paragraph would have clashed with their assumptions about teaching writing. Their

conclusion about these texts very well might have been that they do a poor job of covering the paragraph, something which they would have regarded as important. Using Warriner's text, on the other hand, allows teachers to focus instruction on the paragraph (expository paragraph), the topic sentence, support, and concluding sentence, and teach the essay (expository) as if it is nothing more than a big paragraph. In short, Warriner's text presents a simple scheme for teaching the paragraph (and by extension the essay as well). These competing texts, on the other hand, present the paragraph as another form of composing (oral and written), and not as the central feature of an approach to teaching writing.

One of summarizing why these competing texts may not have been able to capture the imagination of English teachers in the post war period is that to a certain extent they all have the same problem: each tries to capitalize on what is popular at the time--popularized progressivism, the communications movement, and current-traditional rhetoric. Unfortunately, in trying to be all things to all teachers, perhaps they fail to do any of them very well. Warriner, on the other hand, focuses his attention on those things which most English teachers already believed or had few reasons not to believe. That is why, most English teachers may have viewed Warriner's approach as much more coherent, theoretically sound, and teachable than the approaches in these competing texts. However, one question remains unanswered: Even if these competing texts were not very good, why is it that so many English teachers so readily accepted Warriner's approach, an approach that the first part of this paper shows is little more than recycled ideas from late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical theory and practice?

English Teachers and Preparation for Teaching Writing

Part of the answer to the question just posed might possibly be related to the fact that English teachers were very poorly prepared for teaching writing. As a result, many teachers may have been drawn to Warriner's approach because his view of teaching and learning to write is simplistic and easy to teach and because it is the only approach that many of them had ever known. In his 1983 study of college English programs to determine the extent to which English majors are trained in the new knowledge in the teaching of writing, Burhans (1983) found that college English programs have remained "largely unchanged in nearly a century" (p. 654). What he means by this is that since at least the turn of the century, college English departments have been primarily concerned with preparing literary scholars at the expense of rhetoric and composition (Berlin 1987, p. 55). One of the most telling statistics in Burhans' study is that

> Fewer than a third of schools require English Education majors to have any direct instruction in writing beyond the freshman level, and only 10% require them to have at least one course in teaching writing. (1983, p. 649)

Burhans' 1983 findings echo what Berlin found in examining college English programs in the early part of the century: "To many faculty," Berlin writes, "the freshman writing course had come to stand for all of the possibilities of rhetoric" (1987, p. 55). In short, for most of this century the only training most high school English teachers received in teaching writing in their English teacher preparation programs has been freshman composition.

This lack of even minimal training in a subject that most high school English teachers are likely to spend considerable time teaching has serious consequences and relates directly to the rise of Warriner s. In the October 1941 issue of *College English*, James McCrimmon decries the fact that college English teachers rely on handbooks to teach freshman composition courses (p. 70). He traces the problem to the lack of training in English programs and notes that the end result is that "the English handbook is often the teacher's teacher" (p. 70). In other words, these college teachers learn about language and composition from a handbook that they end up using in their courses to teach composition. What was true for college English teachers in 1941 is probably just as true (if not more so) for secondary English teachers charged with teaching composition to high school students in post World War II America. In fact, nearly forty years later, Stewart (1978) notes in a study of college level composition textbooks that the reason textbooks have hardly changed at all in the twentieth century is that English teachers continue to buy the books, and they continue to buy them because their

> knowledge of composition history and theory is not up-to-date. In many cases, it has never existed. Why? Because the professional training of the English teacher has been in literature. (p. 175)

As McCrimmon and Stewart argue, in the absence of adequate training in rhetoric and composition, English teachers have looked to textbooks to provide answers for teaching composition. In fact, Conners (1986) makes this same point in stronger terms. In his study of the evolution of writing and the teaching of writing, he found that unlike other disciplines,

> . . . composition studies *had* no scholarly professionals between 1900 and 1930. English departments during that period of time saw composition as degrading hackwork, apprenticeship to higher literary studies, and did not encourage theoretical speculation. . . .
>
> As a result, . . . the conservative influence of textbooks became pervasive. [A] popular textbook . . . was the commonest artifact in a teacher's world. A textbook was placed in her hands as a graduate student, and most teachers assumed that the wisdom of the text was the wisdom of the world. They read their texts, they studied their handbooks, they taught their tools. Composition was the only college-level course consistently carried on by people whose only real training came from the rules and tenents found in the textbooks they asked their students to buy. (p. 190)

In fact, Conners notes that because of this unusual situation college level composition textbooks remained virtually unchanged from 1950 to 1980 (p. 191).

Given the situation Conners describes with regard to composition theory and instruction, it should not be surprising to find that at the end of World War II secondary English teachers would follow the lead of their college counterparts. This is exactly what Applebee (1974) found in examining studies of teaching practices in the secondary schools during this period of time. He cites research that indicates that in secondary schools the textbooks were in charge of training writing teachers before they teach the

students (p. 127). Sadly, James McCrimmon's 1941 description of an English teacher at Penn State trying to teach writing to college freshmen is likely just as accurate at describing how the typical secondary English teacher during this same time taught writing: "... he clings to his handbook as a shipwrecked sailor clings to his raft, and by an interesting human weakness, soon comes to believe that these rules, which yesterday were unknown to him, are the sole criteria of good writing" (p. 71).

Why was it that in the late 1940's and early 1950's, the textbook that a majority of secondary English teachers would look to for their own training and use in the classroom to teach students how to write was Warriner's? In part, the answer might possibly be that Warriner's approach offered teachers what they were accustomed to, the approach that they most likely experienced in freshman composition taught by one of McCrimmon's graduate students. With this single course as their only source of knowledge in rhetoric and composition and in how to teach composition, it should not come as a surprise that these teachers would reject approaches that contained anything other than current-traditional rhetoric. Further, despite the fact that Warriner s approach is based on outmoded views of most of the theory that informs the text, what he really had to offer teachers was current-traditional rhetoric in a more easily digestible form than anyone else presented. In other words, rather than dealing with the complexities of language, rhetoric, and psychology, as some of the competing texts analyzed in this paper do, Warriner's approach allows teachers and students to believe that using language, that writing, is a kind of simple addition problem: rule 1 (introductory paragraph), plus rule 2 (three body paragraphs), plus rule 3 (concluding paragraph), equals composition (five paragraph theme).

Stated another way: Despite the fact that his text is based on nineteenth century interpretations of eighteenth century conceptions of language, grammar, rhetoric, and psychology, the market success of Warriner's series in the years following World War II might possibly be attributed to the following factors: 1) most English teachers lacked even minimal training in teaching writing; 2) these poorly trained English teachers quite possibly were unable to imagine teaching writing in ways other than the way they were taught; 3) thus, textbooks that attempted to present even some of the complexities involved in understanding and using language were probably rejected by these teachers; and 4) Warriner's text might possibly have been widely accepted by these same teachers precisely because it presents a simplistic view of language learning and teaching, the same view that they had in college, a view based on late nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical theory.

Discussion

Despite his claims that his approach is based on the axioms or essentials of writing, the evidence overwhelming shows that Warriner's *English Workshop Series* is based on late nineteenth century current-traditonal rhetorical theory and practice. This analysis demonstrates how Warriner's approach is based on nearly every major and minor theoretical assumption, belief, and premise, as well as key instructional and textbook practices, of nineteenth century current-traditional rhetoric. In fact, this analysis illustrates that the theory that informs Warriner's approach and most practices contained in the series are relatively unchanged from the nineteenth century. In at least one instance--the overall organization of his

text--Warriner even reintroduces the method of organization that was popular until around the turn of the century. Clearly, nineteenth century current-traditional rhetorical theory is the major guiding force of Warriner's approach.

Based on his analysis of the history of rhetoric, Berlin argues that

> Current-traditional rhetoric has been the most pervasive of objective rhetorics in the last hundred years and, in fact, the dominant rhetoric overall. For a majority of English teachers, it has been a compelling paradigm, making it impossible for them to conceive of the discipline in any other way. (1987, p. 9)

Given Berlin's conclusion and the fact that Warriner's approach is based on current-traditional rhetoric, it would be easy to draw the conclusion that the initial market success of Warriner's series is due to the fact that the series is based on this theory. Without a doubt, the theory that informs Warriner's approach is the major reason for the initial market success of the series, especially given that most English teachers had very little or no training in teaching composition, and what little knowledge and experience they did have was likely from an English graduate student in freshman composition who taught from a current-traditional handbook; this situation may have made Warriner's text seem all the more inviting, since it was what teachers were accustomed to in college.

However, the theory that informs Warriner's text cannot by itself account for the phenomenal initial success of the text. Why? One major reason is that there were other secondary composition texts on the market at

the time Warriner's appeared that were, at least in part, based on current-traditional rhetoric, so why didn't one of these texts experience the phenomenal sales that the Warriner series did? Tchudi and Mitchell argue that the series was successful because, just like Lindley Murray before him, Warriner "taught the basic structure of English," and he "told about this structure more clearly than anyone else in his time" (1989, p. 21). While it is true that much of Warriner's text focuses on the basic structure of English, and his discussion of that structure is clear, this argument ignores the fact that Warriner presents an overly simplistic view of rhetoric and compostion, particularly the composing process. Furthermore, his text is based on nineteenth century interpretations of eighteenth century conceptions of language, grammar, rhetoric, and psychology. In short, his approach is based on outmoded views of most of the theory that informs his text. Perhaps, in contrast to other popular texts of his day, What Warriner's text really had to offer was current-traditional rhetoric in a more easily digestible form than anyone else presented. In other words, rather than dealing with the complexities of language, rhetoric, and psychology, as some of the texts analyzed in this paper attempt to do, Warriner's approach allows teachers and students to believe that using language, that writing, involves nothing more than memorizing a formula, a kind of simple addition problem: rule 1 (introductory paragraph), plus rule 2, (three body paragraphs), plus rule 3 (concluding paragraph), equals composition (five paragraph theme); or, as Hairston (1990) argues in discussing some of the assumptions of the current-traditional rhetoric paradigm, Warriner's approach encourages teachers to continue to teach writing

> . . . based on some idealized and orderly vision of what literature scholars, whose professional focus is on the written product, seem to imagine is an efficient method of writing. It is a prescriptive and orderly view of the creative act, a view that defines the successful writer as one who can systematically produce a 500-word theme of five paragraphs, each with a topic sentence. (1990, p. 5)

However, the Warriner series offered something more for poorly trained writing teachers, something which may have had considerable appeal and might possibly have played a role in the initial popularity of the series. Donlan (1979) and Applebee (1974) argue that one of the national reform movements that influenced English instruction was a series of reports that were a cooperative effort of the Educational Policies Commission of NEA, USOE and the American Association of School Administrators. The Commission first met in 1942, and they set out to create a post-war educational blueprint. Their first report, *Education for ALL American Youth*, was published in 1944. As Donlan (1979) notes, the report reflected the aims of 1930's progressive education, the spirit of 1940s patriotism, and foreshadowed the 1950s concern for excellence. The report described educational utopias--American City and Farmville--which emphasized vocational training and technology, both of which, they perceived, would be important to post-war rehabilitation. The report said very little about language arts instruction, particularly writing, but what it did say might possibly be relevant to the success of Warriner's texts. The Commission recommended

> frequent experiences in the use of language, through oral and written reports. . . . There is also (in Farmville) an "English workshop," where students may go to have their reports read and criticized and to get assistance whenever they encounter language difficulties (pp. 140-1).

It might be mere coincidence that the title of the Warriner series is the *English Workshop Series;* however, this explanation does not take into account the fact that in his preface to *Book I,* Warriner (1948) describes his series in much the same way that the Commission describes their utopias. Warriner says that in his handbook "the student will find here a clear answer to any question of written or oral English which is likely to confront him" (p. iv). In addition, Warriner says that

> . . . there is a workbook for each high school grade. The terminology and the statement of rules is uniform throughout the series. The workbooks provide extra drill at those points where it is likely to be needed most (p. vi).

In other words, here is the Commission's utopian "workshop" where students get assistance with their language problems. The only difference is that the "workshop" turns out to be nothing more than rules and drill in the handbook and additional drill in the workbook.

It is probably not fair to conclude that Harcourt Brace purposely set out to convince English teachers that in purchasing the *English Workshop Series* they were getting what the Commission recommended; however, the evidence does suggest that they may have borrowed the title from the

report and may have rather loosely borrowed some ideas in the hopes of capitalizing on a report that they believed would be a major influence in education.

Over the years, the Warriner series has become an easy target for critics, reformers, composition theorists, researchers, and scholars. They have lamented the seeming continued dominance of current-traditional rhetorical theory, especially as composition theory and research have demonstrated the shortcomings of this approach in teaching composition (Hillocks 1986). They often point to the Warriner series as a prime example of this dominance, and, indirectly at least, seem to want to blame Warriner and/or textbook companies who publish Warriner's and its many clones for the dominance of this paradigm. For example, in his plea for better textbooks, Guth (1989) laments the fact that by the late 1980's textbook companies were doing their best to "out Warriner-Warriner." His attack on textbook companies seems to indicate that they and perhaps Warriner as well are somehow responsible for the dominance of current-traditional rhetorical theory and practice. In their call for research in composing, Odell, Cooper, and Courts (1978) suggest that Warriner and perhaps by extension the textbook companies are somehow responsible for the dominance of current-traditional rhetoric. After a paragraph attacking some of the assumptions of Warriner's text, they dismiss the approach by arguing that

> It seems pointless to attack the point of view epitomized in Warriner's text; we can just let I. A. Richards (1936) dismiss it with his phrase "the usual postcard's worth of crude common sense." (p. 1)

However, blaming Warriner and/or the textbook companies for the dominance of current-traditional rhetoric is akin to attacking the messanger because of the message he carries. As this study shows, the theory that guides Warriner's text is the primary reason for its initial success. However, at least two other factors--the failure of competing texts to provide imaginative and compelling alternative approaches, and poor teacher training in rhetoric and composition--probably contributed to the initial success of the series. Those who attack Warriner and/or the textbook companies because current-traditional rhetorical theory dominates thinking in the profession may well be ignoring other possible contributing causes for the success of the series and the dominace of the current-traditional paradigm. If policymakers, administrators, teachers, and the public want better composition textbooks and better writing instruction in the schools, then perhaps they need to address the causes such as poor teacher training that gave rise to Warriner's and contributed to the dominance of current-traditional rhetoric.

The previous research discussed in this study on current-traditional rhetoric and textbooks has focused by and large on the broad strokes: that is, it has focused on painting a picture of the historical development of rhetorical theory, the English curriculum, and instructional practices in schools and colleges. This study shows the inter-relationship of teacher training, textbooks, and rhetorical theory and practice in composition instruction in secondary schools and colleges. The rise of Warriner's at the end of World War II *is* this story. This story is a pointed reminder of why Maxine Hairston (1990) recently warned that current-traditional rhetoric is not dead. She argues that

> . . . the overwhelming majority of college writing teachers in the United States are not professional writing teachers. They do not do research or publish on rhetoric or composition, and they do not know the scholarship in the field; they do not read the professional journals and they do not attend professional meetings such as the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication; they do not participate in faculty development workshops for writing teachers. They are trained as literary critics first and as teachers of literature second, yet out of necessity most of them are doing half or more of their teaching in composition. And they teach it by the traditional paradigm, just as they did when they were untrained teaching assistants ten or twenty or forty years ago. Often they use a newer edition of the same book they used as teaching assistants. (pp. 5-6).

If what she says is true for college instructors, then as the data presented here suggest, it is probably more so for high school English instructors. Her comments are consistent with the data presented in this study. If so little has changed in the more than forty years since the publication of the first edition of the Warriner series, then it should not be surprising to find that it still dominates the market. In fact, if Hairston is correct, then the findings of this study may have as much to say about composition theory and practice in 1993 as they do about composition theory and practice in 1952.

While this study has helped to provide answers to questions regarding the theory that informs and the reasons for the initial success of Warriner's

text, it has not been able to examine questions about how Warriner's would become and remain for forty years, "the one most widely used in public schools" (Odell, Cooper and Courts 1978, p. 1). The present study points in the direction of some possible questions for further research: (1) to what extent does current-traditional rhetorical theory continue to inform the series over its many editions; (2) to what extent does current-traditional rhetorical theory or other theories contribute to the continued success of the series; (3) to what extent does Warriner attempt to incorporate and/or capitalize on fads, trends, or movements in education over its many editions; (4) to what extent does incorporating or capitalizing on fads, trends, or movements in education contribute to the market success of the book. While the present study may only suggest possible research questions that may some day help explain why so many secondary English teachers believed in the Warriner approach for so long a period of time, it has explored reasons for the popularity of the Warriner series in the schools in the years following World War II.

References

Applebee, A. N. (1986). Problems in process approaches: Toward a reconceptualization of process instruction. In A. R. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae (Eds.), *Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 95-113). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. (1974). *Tradition and reform in the teaching of English: A history*. Urbana: NCTE.

Bain, A. (1866). *English composition and rhetoric: A manual*. London: Longmans

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges*, 1900-1985. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

_____. (1984). *Writing instruction in nineteenth-century American colleges*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

_____. (1990). Writing instruction in school and college English. 1890-1985. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A short history of writing instruction from ancient Greece to twentieth-century America* (pp. 183-220). Davis, Ca.: Hermagoras Press.

Botts, R. C. (1970). *Influences in the teaching of English, 1917-1935: An illusion of progess*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University.

Bowles, S., and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Bryant, M. M., Howe, M. L., Jenkins, P. R., and Munn, H. T. (1950). *English at work: course two*. New York: Charles Scribner s Sons.

Burhans, C. S, Jr. (1983). The teaching of writing and the knowledge gap. *College English*, 45, 639-656.

Conners, R. J. (1986). Textbooks and the evolution of the discipline. *College Composition and Communication*, 37, 178-194.

Donlan, D. (1979). Shadows of force: The teaching of writing in the post-war years. *English Journal*. 68 (April): 73-78.

English Workshop. (1954). Advertisement: Harcourt, Brace and Company. *English Journal*. 43 (September): n. p.

Fogarty, D. (1959). *Roots for a new rhetoric*. New York: Teacher s College, Columbia University Press.

Genung, J. F. (1885). *The practical elements of rhetoric*. Amherst, MA.: J. E. Williams.

_____. (1887). *A study of rhetoric in the college course*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.

_____. (1893). *Outlines of rhetoric*. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Graff, G. R. (1987). *Professing literature: An institutional history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gruen, F. B. (1934). *English grammar in American high schools since 1900*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America.

Guth, H. P. (1989). A plea for better books. *English Journal*. 78 (October): 14-17.

Hairston, M. (1990). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), *Rhetoric and composition: A sourcebook for teachers and writers, third edition* (pp. 3-15). Portsmouth, N. H.: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Halloran, M. S. (1990). From rhetoric to composition: The teaching of writing in America to 1900. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A short history of writing instruction from ancient Greece to twentieth-century America* (pp. 151-182). Davis, Ca.: Hermagoras Press.

Hepburn, A. D. (1875). *Manual of English rhetoric*. Cincinnati, OH: Van Antwerp, Bragg and Company.

Hill, A. S. (1892). *The foundations of rhetoric*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

_____. (1878). *The principles of rhetoric and their application.* New York: American Book Company.

Hill, D. J. (1878). *The elements of rhetoric and composition.* New York: Sheldon and Company.

Hillocks, George, Jr. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching.* Urbana, IL: NCRE and ERIC/RCS.

Kett, J. F. (1977). *Rites of passage: Adolescence in America: 1790 to the present.* New York: Basic Books.

Kitzhaber, A. R. (1953). *Rhetoric in American colleges. 1850-1900.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington.

Lunsford, A. A. (1982). Alexander Bain s contributions to discourse theory. *College English,* 44, 290-300.

Lynch, J. J., and Evans, B. (1963). *High school English textbooks: A critical Examination.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

McCrimmon, J. (1941). The importance of the right handbook. *College English.* 3 (October): 70-72.

National Education Association. Educational Policies Commission. (1944) *Education for ALL American youth.* Washington, D. C.: NEA.

Odell, L., Cooper, C. R., and Courts, C. (1978). Discourse theory: Implications for research in composing. In C. R. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.). *Research on composing: Points of departure*(pp. 1-12). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Parker, R. P., Jr. (1979). From Sputnik to Darmouth: Trends in the teaching of composition. *English Journal* 68 (September): 32-37.

Richards, I. A. (1936). *The philosophy of Rhetoric.* New York: Oxford University press.

Rogers, P. C., Jr. (1965). Alexander Bain and the rise of the organic paragraph. *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* 51: 399-408.

Stahl, D. E. (1965). *A history of the English curriculum in American high schools.* Chicago: The Lyceum Press.

Stewart, D. C. (1978). Composition textbooks and the assault on tradition. *College Composition and Communication.* 29, 171-176.

Tchudi, S. (1979). Composition and rhetoric in American secondary schools 1840-1900. *English Journal* 68 (April): 34-39.

Tchudi, S. and Mitchell, D. (1989). A documentary history of the teaching of English. In S. Tchudi and D. Mitchell, *Explorations in the teaching of English, third ed.,* (pp. 1-33). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.

Tressler, J. C. (1940). *English in action: course three, third ed.* New York: D. C. Heath and Company.

_____. (1945) *English in action: course three, fourth ed.* New York: D. C. Heath and Company.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Warriner. (1954). Advertisement: Harcourt, Brace and Company. *English Journal.* 43 (January): n. p.

Warriner, J. F. (1948). *Handbook of English: 1.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

_____. (1951). *Handbook of English: 2.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Wendell, B. (1891). *English composition.* New York: Charles Scribner s Sons.

Woolley, E. C., Scott, F. W., and Tressler, J. C. (1944). *Handbook of writing and speaking.* Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.